

1964

6455

corrupt then the Government will fail; and if the people of any State cannot be trusted to conduct their own elections then no kind of force used by the General Government will suffice to produce an honest result. The whole history of the Government shows that it is better to trust the people of the States, to permit them to control their own local affairs in their own way. Such was the intention of the framers of the Constitution, and every attempt to turn from their teachings has proven disastrous to our institutions.

These are the principal reasons why I favor the passage of the present bill, and I confidently believe that time will show that complaints of fraud in the election of Members of Congress will be far less numerous when this power is entrusted to the people of the several States of this Union.

Mr. President, my address today has been on title I. I was pleased to have the exchange of ideas with other Senators, and I am more convinced than ever—the more I study the question, the more convinced I become—that it would be absolutely unconstitutional for the Congress to pass a civil rights bill of the nature now proposed. I have pointed out some of the objections to title I in my speech today. I reiterate, there is no question that title I violates the Constitution in that it would deprive people of the right of trial by jury, and also would attempt to get Congress to pass a law to fix voter qualifications when the Constitution of the United States has fixed that by adopting the qualifications of the respective States of the Nation, with regard to voting for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, I want it understood, and I ask unanimous consent, that my yielding today to various Senators did not constitute separate appearances on this occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Since I have not completed this address, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to complete it on another day.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator when he asks the Chair to be allowed to complete his address on another day, whether this constitutes a speech on the bill as is. I am sure the Senator will have plenty of opportunity to submit amendments, but I did not know we had established any precedent of that kind. I assume the Senator can complete anything he wishes on another day, if he is recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York object to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. JAVITS. I am trying to get at the exact import of his request. If the idea is to have one speech continued day after day, I must object. I do not see how we can possibly do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Carolina rephrase his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. THURMOND. In some instances one can complete an address, but I have not completed this address on title I, and I just wished to finish it on another day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair correct in interpreting the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina to mean that for this particular speech he desires to complete it on another day, and its continuation, plus today's remarks are to be interpreted as only one speech under the rule?

Mr. THURMOND. I should like my address not to be considered as one speech until I have finished it. I am not quite through with it. That is what my unanimous consent is about.

Mr. JAVITS. I objected to that unanimous-consent request. I now ask the Senator from South Carolina to yield, without losing his right to the floor and without it counting as another speech, to allow me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New York for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THURMOND. I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the floor, but the Senator from New York requested the Senator from South Carolina to yield to him so that he might suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator from South Carolina does have the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. It will be quite all right to suggest the absence of a quorum, with that understanding.

First, I wish to discuss another subject.

BIBLE READING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a communication I have received from Mr. Woodrow W. Britton of Charleston, S.C., with regard to the recent news story indicating that the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs will take a public stand in opposition to proposals to reverse the Supreme Court decisions against prayers and Bible reading in our schools. This letter takes sharp issue with the position of the committee as reported in the news.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix to the Record the letter from Mr. Britton together with a resolution from the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church in Charleston, S.C., and also an article from the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., dated March 26, 1964. The article is entitled "Area Baptists Back Proposal To Allow School Bible Reading."

The Baptists represented by Mr. Britton's group of Christian laymen and also those of the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church feel very strongly about the need for amending the Constitution to overrule the Supreme Court's recent anti-prayer decisions. I appreciate their position, Mr. President, and I commend them for their strong stand. Therefore, it is a pleasure for me to present this material to the Senate so that there might be no mistaken idea as to where these Baptists stand—and I am confident the overwhelming majority of southern Baptists stand—on this important question.

I ask unanimous consent that this material may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AREA BAPTISTS BACK PROPOSAL TO ALLOW SCHOOL BIBLE READING

Petitions are being circulated locally to support passage of a proposed constitutional amendment permitting Bible reading in public schools.

Local Baptist ministers generally are in favor of the amendment despite a recent announcement from the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs opposing the amendment on various technical grounds.

The committee, authorized to inform Baptists of legislation that affects religion, is not authorized to speak for the eight Baptist organizations it represents, Dr. John A. Hamrick, pastor of Charleston's First Baptist Church, explained last night.

The eight Baptist groups represented in the committee are the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Baptist Convention, Baptist General Conference, North American Baptist General Conference, National Baptist Conference, Baptist Federation of Canada, National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., and General Conference of Seventh-Day Baptists.

Dr. Hamrick also explained that while the committee is not in power to speak for their various groups it is entitled to its opinion. "I don't believe it was their intention to make any pronouncement," he said.

An article in the March 7 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer reported that the committee was calling for "defeat of any amendment to the Constitution which would permit the reading of prayers or the Bible in public schools."

W. Harry Garrett of Washington, D.C., associate director of the committee, was quoted as saying "the statement puts us on record as opposing any constitutional amendment which will allow the Bible in public schools."

Dr. Hamrick said last night that he had spoken at length with Mr. Garrett about the article in the Philadelphia newspaper and that Mr. Garrett said he had been misquoted. The committee did not intend to voice opposition to any such amendment but to the particular one known as the Becker amendment, believing it to have technical flaws, Dr. Hamrick explained.

Approval of the Becker amendment was, however, given by Dr. Hamrick and by other Baptist ministers and congregations in the Charleston area.

The Reverend Paul M. Pridgen, Jr., pastor of the First Baptist Church of North Charleston, credited the North Charleston Ministerial Association with promoting the signing of the petitions. "I cannot speak for other Baptists any more than that committee can, but I can say that I and my congregation are wholeheartedly in favor of the amendment," he said.

Dr. John E. Huss, pastor of the Charleston Heights Baptist Church, said:

"I will wholeheartedly support any constitutional effort to permit Bible reading and prayer in our school system. Our country, to be at her best, must include God in her plans. 'In God We Trust' should be more than a mere slogan on our coins.

"Bible reading and prayer could hurt no one and be a help to everyone.

"Our survival as a nation depends upon our spiritual heritage."

The Reverend Douglas O. Newton, pastor of the Brentwood Baptist Church, said:

"The Baptist joint committee on public affairs' effort to defeat the amendment which would allow the Bible and prayers in our public schools is contrary to Baptist policy

and Baptist doctrine. The committee does not speak for me."

The Reverend Howard S. Knowles, pastor of the Friendship Baptist Church of North Charleston, said:

"I personally have signed a petition which calls for adoption of the amendment. I believe in separation of church and state but not in separation of God and state.

"Let's compare this group (Baptist joint committee) to one of our elected public officials, a Congressman. He is elected to speak for us in Washington, but he doesn't always think and vote the way we all think he should. That's the case with this group, I think."

The Reverend Earl Behr, pastor of the Windsor Baptist Church, said:

"I favor the reading of the Bible and having prayer in our public schools. I am not in favor of obligatory Bible reading in public schools or obligatory prayers. But I am in favor of the amendment."

Members of the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church unanimously adopted a resolution last night which disapproves and denounces the invalid action of the Baptist joint committee on public affairs."

The Rutledge Avenue Baptist resolution stated, in part:

"The action of the said Baptist joint committee and any action its officers may exercise in making it appear that our church is opposed to the said Becker amendment violates the basic principle on which churches of the Southern Baptist Convention were established."

The resolution was signed by the Reverend D. N. Baker, pastor of the church, and Gladys W. Bailey, church clerk. Copies are being sent to the Baptist joint committee, Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Senator STROM THURMOND, and various news media throughout the Charleston area and South Carolina.

CHARLESTON, S.C., March 26, 1964.

HON. J. STROM THURMOND,
Member of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As chairman of a group of Christian laymen, who are sponsoring and distributing petitions in South Carolina and wherever possible, supporting the Becker amendment (which will return the Bible to our public schools on a voluntary basis) I am therefore, deeply interested in same.

I am sending you a copy of a statement and resolution, that my church, the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church adopted by unanimous vote on March 25, 1964, regarding the action of the Baptist joint committee on public affairs. Also, a page of the News and Courier with an article about said committee's action and the Baptist support of the amendment in our area.

We would appreciate whatever you can do via publicity to assist us in our endeavor to eliminate any misunderstanding of our support and feelings in regard to the Becker amendment.

With kindest regards and many thanks, I am,

Sincerely yours,
Woodrow W. Britton,
Chairman.

RUTLEDGE AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH,
Charleston, S.C.

Whereas the Becker amendment (which will return the Bible and permit prayers in our public schools on a voluntary basis); and

Whereas section 2 of said amendment declares "Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or

place, or upon an coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States"; and

Whereas on March 7, 1964 (published in the Philadelphia Inquirer) in Atlantic City March 8: "A committee representing eight Baptist organizations called Friday for the defeat of any amendment to the Constitution which would permit the reading of prayers or the Bible in public schools"; and

Whereas the said committee (Baptist joint committee on public affairs) as stated in said publication, consists of representatives from the Southern Baptist Convention and this committee has expressed opposition to the said Becker amendment; and

Whereas W. Barry Garrett, of Washington, D.C., associate director of the committee, said: "The statement puts us on record as opposing any constitutional amendment which will allow the Bible in public schools;" and

Whereas Garrett also said: "The committee had authorized C. E. Carlson, executive director of the group, to appear before the House Judiciary Committee to present its views"; and

Whereas this action by the said committee has been broadcast over many radio stations and published in other news media; and

Whereas the Baptist churches of the Southern Baptist Convention are autonomous and approve or disapprove proceedings or business matters and take a stand by a majority vote of the members voting in a conference meeting of the individual churches; and

Whereas, many members of our church, including our pastor, have signed petitions supporting the said Becker amendment mentioned herein; and

Whereas the representatives, from Southern Baptist Convention, who are participating in the said, Baptist joint committee on public affairs, have no authority, whatsoever, to speak for or on behalf of members of the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church, and, therefore, any views of C. E. Carlson, executive director, or any member of said joint committee, presented to the House Judiciary Committee or any other group do not represent the views of the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church and are not valid; and

Whereas the action of the said Baptist joint committee and any action its officers may exercise in making it appear that our church is opposed to the said Becker amendment violates the basic principle on which churches of the Southern Baptist Convention were established and operate; now

Therefore, we the members of the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church, 554 Rutledge Avenue, Charleston, S.C., do hereby resolve and go on record as disapproving and denouncing the invalid action of the Baptist joint committee on public affairs.

The above statement and resolution adopted in conference March 25, 1964, by unanimous vote.

Rev. DOUGLAS N. BAKER,
Pastor.
GLADYS W. BAILEY,
Clerk.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

A NEW CRISIS IN LATIN AMERICA

During the delivery of Mr. THURMOND's speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon, provided that in doing so I do not lose my right to the floor and that it will not count as a second speech.

Mr. MORSE. And that my remarks be printed elsewhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that if there is any chance of his getting someone to sit for him during the next few minutes, both he and I should be in the Foreign Relations Committee to listen to Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Mr. Thomas Mann. I am advised that a new crisis has developed in Latin America. I have assured Mr. Mann that I will be down shortly, and I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Minnesota could possibly be there also. However, it may not be possible because of his duty as the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor of the Senate.

PRESIDENT MACAPAGAL OF THE PHILIPPINES AND THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

During the delivery of Mr. THURMOND's speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by W. D. Friedenberg and published in the Washington Daily News today, entitled "Filipinos Outraged by Morse Slur." The remarks therein are attributed to President Macapagal, of the Philippines allegedly in response to my own comments about his views on the civil war in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILIPINOS OUTRAGED BY MORSE SLUR
(By W. D. Friedenberg)

MANILA, March 31.—President Diosdado Macapagal said today the Philippines would enthusiastically provide troops for any operation SEATO decides to undertake.

SEATO, or the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, is a collective defense pact whose membership is made up of the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand.

In an exclusive interview, President Macapagal said: "The Philippines, which fought alongside the United States in two world wars, battled the Japanese 8 years and sent troops to Korea, is one country that cannot be accused of shirking the fight for freedom."

The Philippines, added the 53-year-old President, stoutly favor "putting SEATO into play to safeguard the security, not only of member nations, but others in southeast Asia including South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia."

The President made these fervent remarks without reference to Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, who outraged Filipinos last week by charging that President Maca-

pagal hasn't lived up to his signature on the SEATO pact.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is no question or doubt that the people of the Philippine Islands have been staunch fighters for freedom. They have resisted tyranny when imposed by either white or Asiatic adventurers. They have also been staunch friends of the United States. Among the American people, the Philippines are numbered among that very small group of nations we honestly consider as our friends, not for financial reasons but for ideological reasons.

My quarrel with President Macapagal took form of objecting to his encouragement, yes, his "egging on" of the United States in a war that the Philippines have not seen fit to enter, a war in which the President of the Philippines has yet to exercise any leadership under SEATO to try to bring the dispute in South Vietnam under the provisions and protocol of the SEATO Treaty. That is my criticism of the President of the Philippines, let me say to him from the floor of the Senate this afternoon; and I reiterate every word of it.

"Let's you and him fight in South Vietnam," was the message that came from President Macapagal as quoted in the Washington Post of March 26.

I am pleased that Mr. Macapagal has indicated a willingness for his country to participate in the South Vietnamese war. But I now ask him: Upon what basis? Is his suggestion now that he wishes to go in and follow a military course of action that will kill both American and Filipino boys? In my opinion, such killings are unjustified. They must stop. The United States cannot justify the military course of action which it is following in South Vietnam with its signature attached to treaty after treaty in which we pledge to the world that we stand ready to substitute a peaceful procedure of the application of the rule of law to the jungle law of military force and the U.S. Government is following the jungle law of military force in South Vietnam without one iota of justification.

Mr. President, until SEATO does act in South Vietnam, that organization will be nothing but a mechanism for extracting economic and military aid from the United States. We are extending that military aid and much of the economic aid, to SEATO members so they will be able to cope with the threats to the peace in places like South Vietnam. If they are not going to act when a threat to peace occurs, the justification for most of that aid is removed.

I remind the President of the Philippines that in 1963 his country received \$117,700,000 of aid from the United States; \$23.9 million of it in military aid—\$93.8 million of it in economic aid.

Since 1946 his country has received \$1,851 million of aid; \$423 million of it in military aid, \$1,428 million of it in economic aid.

I believe that those vital statistics leave no room for doubt of the friendliness of the United States for the Philippines.

Moreover, that aid would have gone to the Philippines irrespective of whether SEATO existed, because Mr. Macapagal's

country is a deserving friend of the United States. Our aid to her does not depend on the existence of any Communist threat.

I have voted for that aid to the Philippines and would again.

Within a few days SEATO members will get underway in Manila. As a member of SEATO, the Philippines will have the opportunity to present a program for South Vietnam which will make the civil war there a matter for joint SEATO action, to be undertaken equally by all SEATO members.

I pray to my God that the leaders of SEATO will have the foresight and judgment to seek to resolve the war in South Vietnam. It is basically a civil war fought between and among South Vietnamese without a single proof of any foreign contingency from Communist countries in South Vietnam. The only foreign military personnel in South Vietnam happens to be that of the United States. What a black mark the Secretary of Defense is writing on the glorious history of this Republic in conducting McNamara's war in South Vietnam.

In concluding my remarks on McNamara's war in South Vietnam, I wish to say to the President of the Philippines that he has not rebutted my judgment that his policy has been one of having the United States pick up the check and spill the blood in South Vietnam while the Philippines stood on the sidelines. But if the President of the Philippines now wishes to step up that war and takes the position that SEATO's position should be one of escalating the military effort in South Vietnam, the President of the Philippines is as dead wrong as is the Secretary of Defense of the United States, who has been the force behind McNamara's war in South Vietnam.

The time has come for the leaders of SEATO—and I welcome the President of the Philippines following this course of action—to sit down at the SEATO Conference which will shortly be held in Manila, to see what can be done to resolve the civil war in South Vietnam. The war in South Vietnam is not being conducted by foreign legions from outside South Vietnam, other than the foreign legion of the United States. Ours is the only foreign legion in South Vietnam. I pray that the leaders of SEATO will sit down in the Manila Conference and give consideration to any viewpoint that De Gaulle wishes to offer, for example. It must be remembered that he, too, is a member. Let the record never forget who the members of SEATO are. Let us take a look at them again. They are Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, France, Great Britain, and the United States. All those alleged allies up to this moment have walked out on us in South Vietnam. They have a chance to change that in the forthcoming Conference. They have the chance to try to settle the threat to peace in southeast Asia, or to join the United States in the war.

I also wish to stress the point that we ought to be able to settle the civil war in South Vietnam without continuing the killing of South Vietnamese and American boys. It does not make sense. The people of this country will tell the

Members of the Senate and the Members of the House and the President of the United States and Mr. McNamara and the other members of the administration that they are fed up with the unjustifiable killing of American boys in South Vietnam.

The senior Senator from Oregon will say it in Kansas tomorrow night, in Nebraska within a few nights, and from coast to coast, because he stands ready and willing to take on the administration in debate across this country in opposition to McNamara's war in South Vietnam, and in pursuit of this unjustifiable foreign policy. I will take on any Senator who wants to debate this issue in his State before his people at any place that any Senator wishes to issue the challenge.

I am satisfied that the people of this country are determined to put an end to the unnecessary and unjustifiable American participation in a civil war, which is McNamara's war in South Vietnam.

If SEATO cannot settle the war, or if SEATO does not have the statesmanship to try to settle it by the peaceful procedures of the rule of law for the settlement of international disputes, the United States should take the matter to the United Nations. I said this months ago. We have walked out on our signature on the United Nations Charter in respect to McNamara's war in South Vietnam. The purpose of that Charter is to have the members, acting in concert, bring an end to a threat to peace.

We had to be pushed into it, we had to be dragged into it, but we finally came along in regard to Cyprus and agreed that, after all, the United Nations ought to step into Cyprus, and that a United Nations peace force should be put into Cyprus. That is a pretty black chapter in our foreign policy also.

We wanted NATO to do it, even though Cyprus is not a member of NATO. The United Nations is the body that had clear jurisdiction over the Cyprus issue. Of course, it can be argued, as I have heard it said over and over again—and this is a slim reed on which one can lean—that there is within the framework of the United Nations a provision that permits regional organizations—and SEATO is such an organization, as is NATO, and other alliances—and which justifies procedures that we follow in the Organization of American States, on that international law theory—to try to settle disputes like this.

Let me make clear to the President of the Philippines that if what he has in mind—and it may be in error, but it leaves the impression—is to speed up and intensify and escalate the war in South Vietnam, and if SEATO follows that course of action, it will be just as wrong as McNamara is wrong now in the policies that he has been bespeaking to be American foreign policy without justification under our Constitution in respect to American participation in the war in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I close by raising my voice again in the same plea that I have made for 20 years in the Senate, that there is no hope for peace in the world until the nations of the world are will-

ing to submit for binding, final determination every issue as it arises to the rule of law for the settlement of that issue. There is no hope for peace if powerful nations, or nations which think they are powerful at a given time, are willing to substitute the jungle law of military might and force for the settlement of issues that threaten the peace of the world.

That is what the United States is doing in South Vietnam. History will write a dark chapter of criticism against us.

Let us not try the hypocritical plea that we are supporting freedom in South Vietnam, any more than we were supporting freedom when we supported the Diem puppet state of the United States in South Vietnam.

Let Senators read the letters I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday from American military personnel in South Vietnam. Let them read what our officers are saying about the situation in South Vietnam. They will find from those letters a low state of American military morale in South Vietnam. Many of them are not "buying" McNamara's war in South Vietnam. We are not supporting freedom in South Vietnam. We are supporting military dictatorship.

Has anyone heard the military dictator in South Vietnam say anything about instituting processes of freedom in South Vietnam? Has anyone heard him whisper anything about elections? The last election there occurred during the Diem regime, and then the only candidates were chosen by the regime. Has anyone heard the military dictator, who is supported by the United States in South Vietnam, stand up for the processes of democracy in South Vietnam?

We cannot continue to fool the American people on this situation any longer. They are not going to be fooled.

It is about time for the administration to sit down and reexamine its foreign policy with respect to South Vietnam. If it does, it will have a golden, glorious opportunity to really storm the thought of the world by offering to have the matter taken to the United Nations to be determined under the peaceful procedures of that charter.

Some will say that that cannot be done, that it is not practical to do it that way. We shall never know until we try. I have listened to the arguments of expediency in national affairs for 20 years. I have never known it to be sound. It will never be sound. Why? Because that kind of argument, based upon expediency, is also morally wrong. The senior Senator from Oregon has an abiding faith that if we stand for what is morally right, never compromise, and press on and on, no matter what the opposition is throwing in our way, not we, but that principle will prevail. The principle for which I am pleading again is so morally right that McNamara's war in South Vietnam can never be justified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "McNamara's Gamble," written by Richard Starnes, and pub-

lished in the Washington Daily News of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCNAMARA'S GAMBLE

(By Richard Starnes)

A graph tracing the dizzying ascent of the McNamara myth would show a firm plateau of prestige and power during the second Kennedy year, and an unswerving to a sharp peak in the third month of the Johnson epoch.

The top of the peak would doubtless be shown on the evening of Thursday last, when the Defense Secretary presented his report on his latest explorations in South Vietnam.

His speech was celebrated almost without exception. Most of those in the dismal business of political prognosis were ready to share Mr. Johnson's judgment that Robert S. McNamara was the brightest ornament he had inherited from the late Mr. Kennedy. Pundits wrote that the genius of Mr. McNamara transcended party disciplines and that he might well turn up as Mr. Johnson's vice-presidential candidate, Republican or no Republican.

Mythmaking is the principal industry in the city of Washington, to be sure, but the eager subscribers to the McNamara legend seem to have missed two important points—points that seem to forecast an inevitable downturn in his prestige graph.

Point 1: Whether he intends it or not, Mr. McNamara has gambled all the considerable esteem in which he is held on a successful outcome in Vietnam. Failure (which must include chronic nonsuccess) will be laid at his door. He is now identified as the architect of our Vietnamese war policy; he will reap whatever rewards or penalties the policy produces.

Point 2: Mr. McNamara's white paper on Vietnam bespoke no new policies; it promised more of the same programs that to date must be counted thundering failures.

His account of the waxing and waning of our fortunes in southeast Asia was not notable for candor. He said, for example, that "while the per capita food production in the north was 10 percent lower in 1960 than it had been in 1956, it was 20 percent higher in the south."

This brought a derisive snort from a genuine expert on Vietnam who is well known to me. "With 1956 as a base year," he said, "McNamara can prove anything. In 1956, for the first time since the end of the Japanese occupation, South Vietnam exported zero rice. It was a rice disaster year in the south."

Again, in speaking of the South Vietnamese National Institute of Administration (a training facility for civil servants), Mr. McNamara said it "had been established without technical and financial assistance." The fact is that it was established by the French in 1951, before our commitment in Vietnam. Indeed, by 1962, when we were assisting the program, the paranoia of the Diem regime became so marked that American advisers to the program were cast out by the late brother Nhu, who rightly feared any emerging class of trained and sophisticated civil servants.

"Note well," the independent expert warned, "that McNamara's program contained no demands for elections or other democratic reforms. We are still trying to fight an ideology with an IBM-machine approach, and it can't be done."

Mr. McNamara rejects neutralization and counsels patience in the "long twilight" of travail that faces us in southeast Asia. He promises increments in the armed forces of South Vietnam, although the Saigon regime already has an overwhelming numerical superiority over the hard-core Vietcong parti-

sans. In the present context, it is difficult to repose much hope that more of the same will do the job in the worn, bleeding little Asian country where we are so heavily involved.

Mr. McNamara's prestige in the power structure of Washington is a many-splendored thing—now. But it is worthwhile to point out that in its original meaning, "prestige" is defined as a sorcerer's trick, an illusion, a bit of sleight of hand. Too often it still means that in this city, as numerous fallen idols can testify.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday, when I was discussing McNamara's war in South Vietnam, I placed in the RECORD a large number of letters from all over the country expressing what I said on that occasion was the increasing groundswell of American public opinion against the shocking, in my judgment, completely unjustifiable, war being conducted by the United States in South Vietnam.

In the course of the introduction of those letters three nongermane letters crept into the RECORD. They will be found on page 6378 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 30, 1964, one entitled "Letter on Price Fixing Draws Comment"; another, "New Order Needed To Achieve World Peace"; and the third, "The Sun Is a Cold Body with a Glorified Band of Light Around It—the Sun Is Not a Hot Body."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the final official printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday is printed, these three letters be deleted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made, as indicated.

MARCHING INTO THE SPACE AGE

During the delivery of Mr. THURMOND's speech,

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Marching Into the Space Age, But Astronautics Is Only Part of Stiff Curriculum at U.S. Air Force Academy," printed on March 29, 1964, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCHING INTO THE SPACE AGE: BUT ASTRONAUTICS IS ONLY PART OF STIFF CURRICULUM AT U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

(By Olga Curtis)

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., March 28.—Ten years ago, when the U.S. Air Force Academy was founded, nobody figured that the newest service school might also turn out to be one of the country's greatest tourist attractions.

If this had been foretold, what is going to be one big birthday party in Colorado Wednesday might be a day of mourning in St. Louis. For there was a time when the Academy could just as easily have gone up near Alton, Ill., instead of high on the slopes of the Rampart Range.

Back on April 1, 1954, the Academy was just an act of Congress signed by President Eisenhower. It had no home, no students, and certainly no hint that someday it would draw 2,500,000 visitors a year.